

MAY 24, 1949
561st BROADCAST

Illinois U Library Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



U. S. Pat. Off.

How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr.

Speakers

MILLARD E. TYDINGS

EDWIN C. JOHNSON

DEWEY SHORT

HANSON W. BALDWIN

(See also page 12)

COMING

— May 31, 1949 —

How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?

— June 14, 1949 —

How Can the Free Peoples of the World Best Share Peace and Well-Being?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 15, NUMBER 4

\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 24:

"How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mr. BALDWIN</i>	4
<i>Senator TYDINGS</i>	6
<i>Senator JOHNSON</i>	8
<i>Congressman SHORT</i>	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16



THE BROADCAST OF MAY 31:

"How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?"

THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 14:

"How Can the Free Peoples of the World Best Share Peace and Well-Being?"



The Broadcast-Telecast of May 24, 1949, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MAY 24, 1949

VOL. 15, No. 4

How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?

Announcer:

During the past three weeks we have been announcing the names of leaders of national organizations who will accompany us this summer on our 'Round-the-World Town Meetings and participate in face-to-face discussions with the leaders of the countries we visit. Altogether, these people represent organizations with combined memberships of more than 50 million Americans.

Here are a few more representatives who will be with us: Mr. Norman Cousins, vice president of the United World Federalists and editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*. Dr. Malcolm Davis will represent the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the American Association for the United Nations.

The Association of American Colleges will be represented by its executive director, Dr. Guy Snavely, and Dr. Clarence Decker, president of Kansas City College.

More than twenty national leaders in the fields of business, labor, farm, education, veterans, women, fraternal, and service clubs will accompany us as representatives of their own national organizations. These leaders or their organizations are paying their own expenses of this trip to promote peace and understanding.

Now to preside over our discussion, here is our moderator, the president of Town Hall, New York, and founder of "America's Town Meeting." George V. Denny, Jr. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. When you sit down to work out your budget for the year, you look very carefully at the big items, especially if they keep growing bigger and bigger each year.

While we were at war with an enemy that was seeking to destroy our freedom, we couldn't afford to be economical about what we

spent for national defense; but since the war, we haven't been able to agree upon a proper budget for national defense in these unsettled times.

In President Truman's budget for national defense this year, he included the largest peacetime military budget in our history — some \$15,000,000,000, and now, plus approximately \$1,450,000,000 for the rearmament of Europe.

When we get into figures like this, ladies and gentlemen, the average taxpayer simply doesn't know what they mean. We can understand numbers of planes, ships, tanks, guns, and men. We're beginning to understand the tremendous cost of atomic bombs. But when we get up there into tens of billions of dollars, we're practically lost.

So we'll begin tonight's discussion with a journalist who knows his subject and knows how to ask meaningful questions. We hope he'll ask some on our behalf. He is the military editor of the *New York Times*. Hanson Baldwin, like Senator Tydings, is a native of Maryland. He is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy; but after three years, he resigned his commission to travel and write.

Hanson Baldwin has been with the *Times* since 1929 and has been military editor since 1942. His articles on the South Pacific situation in 1942 won him a Pulitzer Prize. Mr. Baldwin's is not an unfamiliar voice to Town Meeting

listeners. We are happy indeed to have him back on this program this evening. Mr. Hanson Baldwin (Applause.)

Mr. Baldwin:

Mr. Denny has defined national security in terms of men and guns and atom bombs and ships and planes. He is right, of course, but I think we have to be even more specific than that. National security is not only and not primarily numbers. It is things and places—wind tunnels and research facilities, education and training and leadership—intangibles as well as tangibles.

What we are dealing with is not a simple arithmetical proposition. It is probably the most complicated calculus in government, and it is up to my distinguished fellow speakers, the congressional watchdogs of the budget, to solve the equation.

They cannot solve it by rubber-stamping all military appropriation requests or by political log-rolling with defense items. They can solve it, as Mr. Dewey Shows knows, only by careful consideration of each item on the defense budget; by approving it if it is a sound request, by disapproving it if it is a wasteful one.

I would like to stress, too, that the answer to tonight's question "How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?" cannot be in absolutes.

Let's first eliminate the idea of the Maginot Line. We can never

impregnable, and the attempt to become so could make us a bankrupt state and a garrison state, and could provoke war rather than prevent it.

To say that security is relative, not absolute, and that we must take a calculated risk, defines but does not answer the question of how much we must spend. To be more specific, I think the military budget proposed by the President in January—some 15 billion dollars plus—was ample for the next fiscal year. The 630 millions added to this figure by the House is not, in my opinion, needed for a reasonable degree of security in the twelve months ahead.

I would like to pose to Senator Tydings, from my home state of Maryland, one question: Is this \$30 million-dollar House addition to next year's defense budget, in his opinion, necessary?

There are two domestic factors tending to increase the military budget beyond reasonable limits, and both of them are manifestations of the attempt to seek the will-o'-the-wisp of complete or absolute security.

One is the new isolationism, which apparently Senator Johnson epitomizes. This new isolationism has taken an economic trend that supports domestic military expenditures—even increases them while cutting down on foreign aid. Is this sound, Senator Johnson? I don't think so.

The other factor is the fetish

of numbers—an old military mistake. Many of our commanders are understandably so Pearl Harbor conscious that security means to them great numbers of planes, men, or ships actually ready for war.

In this, we differ from the British. We are spending by far the greater part of our military budget in operating and maintaining fleets in the air and at sea; too little, in my opinion, in this age of military change and technological development, in developing finished items of new war materials.

We are putting plenty into basic research, but considerably less into applied development. The British are two years ahead of us in jet-engine development. They are building, today, 10 aircraft carriers to our one. Both the British and the Russians have a far better tank than anything we possess.

These are important factors in real national security. Yet our armed forces, particularly the Navy and the Air Force, are operating very large forces — too large, I think, if we are agreed that war is not imminent.

The major savings in our national defense budget can only come by a reduction in numbers. You can, of course, make savings by greater efficiency — better budgetary and fiscal practices, installation of a sense of cost-consciousness in the military

mind, far closer and more expert congressional scrutiny of the military budget, closer integration of the services, and less wasteful competition.

But such savings, in my opinion, will be numbered in millions—at best in hundreds of millions—not in billions. Yet the size of any cut in the defense budget and how it should be applied is a congressional job which can be done only by sweat and study, toil and analysis—the kind of thorough audit which everyone agrees should be done, but which I submit, Senators Tydings and Johnson and Representative Short, is *not* being done. And I would like to ask, “What are you going to do about it?” (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Baldwin. Well, gentlemen, he's thrown some pretty direct questions to you. We are going to hear now from the Senator from Maryland who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Majority Policy Committee.

Senator Tydings served in the first World War, and rose from the ranks of enlisted men to lieutenant colonel. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Distinguished Service Cross. He has been a member of the Senate since 1926 and stands

third in seniority in that distinguished body.

We are very happy, indeed, Senator Millard E. Tydings, Democrat of Maryland, to have you as our guest on Town Meeting this evening. Senator Tydings. (Applause.)

Senator Tydings:

Mr. Denny. Ladies and gentlemen. I want to stake out an area of general agreement with Mr. Baldwin at the very beginning of my brief statement.

Mr. Baldwin asks, “Is the 63 million dollars which the House of Representatives is appropriating in addition to the approximately 15 billions recommended by the President, necessary?”

My answer is an emphatic “No!” and for the following reasons: First of all, we are now about to pass, in the Senate, amendments to the unification act which, if adopted by the House of Representatives, will result in very substantial savings in our military expenditures for the next year—this, through elimination and consolidation of many diverse opportunities now carried on separately by the Army, Navy and Air Force.

Mr. Hoover estimates these savings to be one billion five hundred million dollars a year. In a more modest way, I would estimate them to be sufficient to at least cover any necessary increases in our defense appropriations above

the 15 billion-dollar ceiling. I will settle for 600 million in savings and be very grateful.

My second reason for saying this extra appropriation is unnecessary is that there is a point where the expense of our armed services can rest so heavily on the industrial and economic structure of the country as to defeat its very own purpose.

We, of course, must have the necessary defense, but we must get that necessary defense so as to permit industry — the industry that provides the sinews of the taxes which support that defense — to have a chance to live.

Now, how much must we spend to get real national security? Obviously, we must spend whatever is needed to insure real national security. We must always have on hands sufficient planes, tanks, ships, guns, and men, etc., etc., to meet any reasonably conceivable threat to our national security.

Unless we do have sufficient planes, tanks, guns, and men, and all the incidental yet necessary things, like wind tunnels, radar screens, proving grounds, research laboratories, guided missiles, atomic bombs, ships, etc., etc., etc., we have, in fact, no real national security at all.

Insufficient national defense is little better, if any, than no defense at all. If a drowning man is going down 30 feet from shore, a 15-foot rope will not save him. So it is with national defense.

France furnishes a sad example of this point in World War II, when an inadequate defense meant subjection of the French people by the conquerors for nearly five years.

Thus, we must examine our foreign policy and assay conditions which from time to time confront us. We must constantly appraise the intentions of every nation or group of nations that seems unfriendly to our country or to the countries that are associated with us.

We must be ready to meet with any emergency that arises from these circumstances within reason.

And lastly, we cannot have more defense than the ability of our country will permit. The extent of our defense must always be measured by the ability of our people to bear the taxation which supports it.

Now in the strictly military field, we must be so strong in the quality of our defense that any aggressor will fear to attack us, and, of course, if the attack comes anyhow, to insure that we will be victorious with the least ultimate cost in men and treasure.

To meet this condition, we have the most powerful Navy in the world, the most powerful Air Force in the world, the core of the most efficient Army in the world, although it is relatively small. We have the atomic bomb, and, through the Marshall Plan, we are building up our possible allies, so

as to make them self-sufficient to form a barrier on the one hand and to help us eventually to bear some of the cost and burden in keeping aggression in check, if it should threaten the world seriously.

These countries of Western Europe are mentally, morally, spiritually, politically, and economically within the orbit of the United States, rather than that of any other part of the world.

With all this defense at home, with our foreign policy and implementation abroad, we are araying the preponderance of might, industrial plants, natural resources, scientific and inventive genius on the side of an adequate and certain defense of the United States of America, and the freedom and liberty which it represents in this war-torn world.

These are the things we must find the money to support for real national security. So long as we maintain these things, we are safe. While we maintain, and only while we maintain them, have we the opportunity to eventually bring destructive elements of world society into harmony, because for them the alternative is coöperation with us, in an atmosphere of fairness, freedom, and good will, or, if they want to fight, defeat, if they insist upon it. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Tydings. Our next speaker is also a Democrat from Colorado, who served

four terms in the Colorado House of Representatives, one term as Lieutenant Governor, two terms as Governor, and has been a member of the United States Senate since 1936. Senator Johnson doesn't always agree with his colleague, Senator Tydings, on military matters and we wonder if he will tonight. Senator Edwin Carl Johnson of Colorado, we are happy to have you back with us. Senator Johnson. (Applause.)

Senator Johnson:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Mr. Baldwin seems disturbed and worried over the new isolationism which he says I epitomize. He should be disturbed and worried instead over the current waste of our money and resources by the armed forces.

Recently, before the Senate Military Service Committee Forum, former President Hoover stated, "Our military budget system has broken down. Congress allocates billions without accurate knowledge as to why they are necessary and what they are being used for. The defense establishment of this country is permeated with waste and inefficiency and duplication of effort." So spoke President Hoover.

Former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, referring to what he termed "the extremely expensive and pernicious practice of empire building by the armed forces," said, "I would hesitate to say how much money has gone

down the drain just due to that single factor. It is very large." That's Secretary Patterson testifying.

America's gotten herself into the fool habit of trying to solve every problem with dollars borrowed from future generations. We just love to spend other people's money. We owe more money three times over than all of the rest of the world combined!

Our Government blows in every cent it can lay its hands on and, when cash runs low, we raise additional funds by placing American infants, not yet born, in permanent bondage.

We just love to kid ourselves, too, with pretty names for disagreeable things. The current borrowing spree, all too cleverly, is named "The Opportunity Bond Drive." Liberty loans and victory loans and opportunity loans roll off our tongues with all the sweet-ness and lure of the singing sirens. We should be honest with ourselves and call these loans what they are, "great grandchildren loans," for we, ourselves, have no honest intention of ever paying one cent toward their retirement.

Deliberately and nonchalantly, we pass them on to succeeding generations to be paid by them out of their blood, their sweat, and their tears.

The President has requested the Congress to plan on spending \$15 billion for domestic rearmament, and six billion dollars for Marshall

Plan aid during the next fiscal year. Furthermore, in addition, the President insists that Congress ratify a military alliance which cannot cost less than twenty billion dollars over the next three years.

For 10 years I have been a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and that Committee and its staff of tax experts are in substantial agreement that taxes cannot be increased this year without running into the probability of diminishing returns.

A deficit of three to five billion dollars is freely predicted for the next fiscal year. That would touch off a new wave of uncontrolled inflation that might shake the very foundation of our Government and push our economy off the deep end into a devastating depression.

Slap-happy, we flounder about the brink of the very disaster Stalin has been predicting so gleefully for us. If we fall into his booby trap, which we ourselves have built, the whole world may go communistic.

Little wonder, then, that George Denny asks, "How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?" While a price tag can never be placed on real national security, further reckless indulgence in deficit spending and loose federal fiscal policies can result only in frightful insecurity.

The Hoover Commission has called attention to the extravagance and the waste of the armed forces.

The Bureau of the Budget, the President's own fiscal agency, has pointed out with graphic charts that 75 cents of every tax dollar now goes to pay for past wars or to prepare for the next war.

There's something radically wrong with the judgment of a nation that plans to spend three times as much for guns as for education.

Ordinary prudence dictates that we reduce our military budget and Marshall Plan expenditures one-third to make certain that we maintain a balanced budget, which is so necessary right now to restore confidence to our sagging economy.

Our military expenditures for the next fiscal year should not go one dime above ten billion dollars. Marshall Plan aid should be held to a total of four billion dollars in the interest of security and solvency.

America, Mr. Denny, should get on its collective knees this very night and pray to God with earnestness and fervor to pound some sense into the Congress before it is too late, and give us the courage to do what we know is right. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Johnson. Well, there seems to be a difference of opinion among our speakers here. For a long time, Congressman Short was the lone Republican Congressman from Missouri. This popular Ozark hill-

billy is one of the best educated men in Congress. (Laughter.) He holds post-graduate degrees from American and European universities. He's the ranking Republican on the House Committee on Military Affairs. We're very glad to welcome Congressman Dewey Short of Missouri back to Town Meeting. (Applause.)

Congressman Short:

Moderator Denny, ladies and gentlemen. This is more of a discussion than it is a debate, chiefly because all four speakers tonight are in fundamental agreement. I think that we realize that in this troubled, war-torn world, and with the uncertainty that hangs over our heads, that until the United Nations becomes more firmly established and can underwrite the security of other nations by having an international police force to carry out its decisions, the United States of America, which is the only nation capable, must, in sheer self-defense and for survival's sake, remain strong on land, sea, and in the air.

I'm a little surprised that Hanson Baldwin, one of the greatest newspaper men in this country and certainly one of the best informed on military affairs, after telling us that Great Britain is far in advance of the United States in the development of jet planes, and is now manufacturing ten aircraft carriers to our one, and that Britain and Russia are both much superior to us in the production

of modern tanks, would advocate a reduction in expenditures for our armed forces. I'm even more surprised that the distinguished and able gentleman, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. Tydings, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, agrees with him.

Now, I disagree. I think the House of Representatives was very wise when it added \$630,000,000 to the \$15,280,000,000, the President recommended, because Congress realizes that, under the Constitution, it is our duty to raise and support the armed forces, and no one else's. We exercised our independence of judgment in voting for a seventy group air force by adding \$630,000,000 to this tremendous budget.

The amount of money spent is not the true criterion of an adequate national defense. The cost of our national defense today is staggering. It's painful. I don't like it any more than I like castor oil, but sometimes I must take it. It's good for us.

Our appropriations for the coming fiscal year for armed services is the stupendous, incomprehensible sum of 15 billion dollars. But it must be borne in mind that a ship today costs 100 million dollars, whereas it cost only 50 million dollars in 1939.

In other words, the 15 billion dollar appropriation for the coming fiscal year is equal to about half that amount, or seven and one-half billion dollars in 1939.

I have consistently taken the

position that the Nation must maintain the armed strength required by the international situation irrespective of cost. Taxes to maintain peace are never as bad as global conflict or military defeat.

I have gone through the unspeakable ruins in both Europe and Asia. Certainly, as costly as our national defense is, it is nothing compared to the complete devastation and the almost absolute destruction of Germany and of Japan.

I also maintain that our armed forces could be operated more efficiently and certainly more economically than they have been since hostilities ceased in 1945. There are areas for vast economy in the habits of expenditure of the military forces without impairment—in fact, with improvement—to the effectiveness of our national security.

The tragedy is that there are few opportunities for the Congress to legislate specific economies and that we must rely to so great an extent upon capable administration to effectuate these savings of public funds.

It's a matter of administration more than it is a matter of legislation. By more efficient administration of the armed forces, by more effective unification, by means of a more consistent national defense and foreign policy on the part of the administration, I believe we should be able to reduce our national defense budget by several billion dollars.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

MILLARD E. TYDINGS — A Democrat from Maryland, Senator Millard E. Tydings is chairman of the Armed Services Committee and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Born in Havre de Grace, Maryland, in 1890, he has an M.E. degree from Maryland Agricultural College, an LL.B. from the University of Maryland, and LL.D. degrees from Washington College and St. John's College.

Admitted to the Maryland bar in 1913, he began his practice of law in Havre de Grace. In 1916, he was elected to the Maryland House of Delegates. He was Speaker in 1920-22, and a member of the Maryland Senate in 1922. He became a member of the United States Congress in 1923, and since 1927 has been a member of the Senate.

Senator Tydings served as a private on the Mexican border in 1916. With the A.E.F. he advanced to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel of the 29th Division Machine Gun Units. He was awarded several citations and honors.

DEWEY SHORT — Before becoming Republican Congressman from Missouri, Dewey Short was professor of psychology and philosophy at Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas. Since then he has represented the State of Missouri and the Republican party in the 71st Congress (1929-31) and the 74th to 81st Congresses (1935-51). Congressman Short's educational background includes graduation from Marionville (Mo.) College; an A.B. degree from Baker University; S.T.D. and LL.D. degrees from Boston University; and further study at Harvard, University of Berlin, Heidelberg, and Ox-

ford University. During World War I, Congressman Short was an acting lieutenant in the U. S. Army. He was delegate to the Republican National Convention in Chicago in 1932.

Congressman Short is a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON — A Democrat from Colorado, Senator Johnson is chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Born in Scandia, Kansas, in 1884, he was a railroader, homesteader, and manager of a farmer coöperative before entering public service as a member of the Colorado Legislature. He served four terms from 1923 to 1931, when he became lieutenant governor of Colorado for one term. Two terms as governor of the state were followed by election to the United States Senate in November, 1936, and continuous membership since then.

HANSON WEIGHTMAN BALDWIN — Military and naval correspondent for the *New York Times*, Mr. Baldwin was born in Baltimore (Md.) in 1903. After his graduation from the U. S. Naval Academy, he served aboard battleships on the Caribbean and in European Squadron, until 1927. Since 1929, he has been with the *New York Times*.

A Pulitzer winner in 1942, Mr. Baldwin is the author of several books, among them *United We Stand*, *Strategy for Victory*, and *The Price of Power*. He also contributes to *Harper's*, *The North American Review*, and other periodicals.

In the Pentagon, the responsibility rests mainly upon the Secretary of Defense to stop needless service bickering; to force attention of the armed services upon economy; to clarify the jurisdiction of the multitudinous boards, agencies, and committees in the national military establishment; to bring order from chaos and produce many hundreds of millions of dollars of savings annually all without impairing in any way the adequacy of our national defense.

I hope that international tensions will subside sufficiently that the American people can safely re-adjust downward, in the next year or two, the national defense budget. We cannot endlessly, without serious danger to our standards of living and to the economy of our country, spend so many billions upon national defense.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Senator Johnson, that financial solvency is

the first line of defense of any country. We dare not wreck the financial structure of this Government. The battle front is never stronger than the home front. A sound economy and healthy industry are essential for the defense of any nation.

In the meantime, fellow Americans, whether we will it or not, we must at all cost maintain a powerful armed force to protect our people from another sneak attack comparable to Pearl Harbor in 1941. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Short. Well, gentlemen, you may not be equally divided on this question, but there does seem to be considerable difference of opinion among you. So, let's have our little discussion around the microphone.

We'll start with Mr. Baldwin, who is rather expert at asking questions. Come along, Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I'd like to pose one to Senator Johnson. He rightfully quoted from the Hoover Commission Report saying that Congress had abnegated its rightful responsibilities under the Constitution and was passing 15 billion-dollar budgets without knowing what they were for. How does Mr. Johnson explain that? Why doesn't Congress do its job?

Congressman Johnson: I wish I knew the answer to that one. We've fallen into the bad habit during the World War of appro-

priating money on faith. Whatever they asked for, we just handed it to them. We never questioned the military as to any amount of money they might ask. And how could we, with our boys and our kinfolks and Americans facing the enemy and baring their breasts to the weapons of our foes? How could we think of such a thing as money?

But now the war is over, and we had better begin thinking about it, and that's what I'm pleading for.

Senator Tydings: I would like to make the comment that Mr. Short seemed to feel that when I opposed the increase over fifteen billion dollars for our national defense that I was supporting an inadequate national defense. My point seems to have escaped him. It is this: I think we can effect economies in the conduct of the Army, Navy, and Air Force sufficient to provide the 70-group Air Force without another single dollar being appropriated.

The Hoover Commission has blazed the trail in that direction. We have a bill—that I hope passed this afternoon, which I introduced and on which we've had five weeks' hearings—which, it is estimated, will save a billion dollars a year in the conduct of our military establishment. We ought to effect some savings as we go along and force these savings so as not to burden the American people unnecessarily. After all, 15 billion dollars is an awful lot of money—and I almost used another

word! (*Laughter and applause.*)

Congressman Short: I certainly would not want to leave the wrong impression, because no member of Congress of either House or Senate is in favor of a strong national defense any more than the Senator from Maryland.

If the unification bill that has passed the Senate—or will pass—is accepted by the House and we can effect the savings—and I think we can effect hundreds of millions of dollars—well and good. All that I insist is that we should have a 70-group Air Force.

In response to the question propounded by Mr. Baldwin, I would like to say that I do not think Congress has neglected its duty of scrutinizing the budget that is sent down to us. Of course, we lack adequate and expert clerical help and advice—we should have additional—but I want to say that the members of the appropriation committees of both House and Senate carefully examine and study in the minutest detail the military budgets sent down to both bodies.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Baldwin, you have another one?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, I'd like to address this to Mr. Short. If that's so, if they make such a careful scrutiny of the budget, how does Mr. Short explain that an item such as El Centro Naval Air Field in California, which the Navy asked to be stricken out of the budget, was kept in the budget due to some little political logrolling where one

Senator traded exchanges for another, or one Congressman for another. That sort of thing goes on a great deal. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Short: Mr. Baldwin is absolutely right. We've got too much of that going on. It's only natural, I suppose, for any member of Congress to fight for projects in his district or state. Too many people judge the value of a Representative by the amount of pork he can carry back home from Washington.

I'm against it as much as Mr. Baldwin. They have made great mistakes and there are gross injustices, but they've de-activated many of these airfields and army groups. They took away Camp Crowder, that great Signal Corps School down on my own District.

Mr. Denny: Thank you for a frank answer, Congressman. Senator Johnson has a comment.

Senator Johnson: I have a question that I want to ask Mr. Baldwin. He's been asking a lot of questions and I want to see how he is on the answers. I want to know about this military aid—I'm not talking about the relief aid that we're giving Europe, but the military aid. I want to know how much he thinks that the military aid which we have planned for Europe is going to cost in the next 20 years and if it will be effective after it is spent.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I think there is some of that new isolationism cropping up again. I don't think anyone can give you an accurate

estimate, Senator Johnson, as you well know, of what the military aid is going to cost for the next 20 years. As a matter of fact, I don't think we have any 20-year program of military aid. I've heard of no one who extends the period that long. The longest I have heard is ten years.

It will be considerable. I think it is a direct contribution to the defense of the United States. Where does the defense of the United States start today? On the Atlantic seaboard, or does it start on the Rhine? I think you can answer that question as well as I can, and if we can defend the Rhine line with American aid, let's do it. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: Let's not have a Maginot Line on the Rhine or any other place.

Mr. Denny: All right, Senator Tydings.

Senator Tydings: To prove that economies can be made, already there have been effected recently many economies by consolidating work that normally was carried on separately by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Only yesterday, in one of the highest levels of military strategy, great activities of the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy were combined, releasing several thousand men and saving many millions of dollars each year.

I want more of that to go on so that we'll have more money for real national defense. I don't want it wasted on useless things that are not necessary. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, very much, Senator. Now gentlemen you've been extremely helpful here in this discussion period. I hope that our question period will be equally helpful, but we must take some questions from the audience. In the meantime, here is a message for our listeners.

Announcer: Here we are in the middle of the 561st broadcast of "America's Town Meeting of the Air" discussing the subject, "How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?" Would you like a copy of tonight's Town Meeting, complete with questions and answers to follow? If you would, then send 10 cents to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, and ask for the TOWN MEETING BULLETIN. Please do not enclose stamps, and allow about two weeks for delivery.

No matter what your opinion may be about tonight's question, by giving \$1 to Town Hall to help send your Town Meeting around the world, you will be making a genuine contribution to real national security. Each week, we receive letters from listeners saying they intended to send their contributions earlier but they just didn't get around to it. Why don't you plan now to send your contribution as soon as this program is over, or the first thing in the morning? Many outstanding American leaders have urged you to support this venture in democracy.

Now, just before we take the

questions from our audience here in Town Hall tonight, here is a message transcribed from another outstanding American to each of you. Listen!

James A. Farley: This is Jim Farley. Millions around the world will gain a better understanding of democracy and America's freedom of opinion this summer when "America's Town Meeting of the Air" visits a dozen capitals.

Town Meeting is traveling around the world from London to Tokyo to prove America's interest in other peoples' problems. You can assist in this dollars for democracy project for world peace and better understanding by sending your dollar to Town Hall, New York.

Announcer: Now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now we'll start with this gentleman down here.

Man: My question is directed toward Senator Johnson. Why doesn't the U. S. promote the cause of world-wide disarmament through the U. N. so that we can reduce our military expenditures safely?

Senator Johnson: That's the answer. You have the solution, my friend. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Tydings has a comment.

Senator Tydings: As one who has twice in the last three years introduced a resolution for world disarmament under proper safeguards, we have tried that twice in the U. N. and the Russians wouldn't agree. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Do you have a comment, Mr. Baldwin?

Mr. Baldwin: I'd like to say "Amen" to Senator Tydings. I think the speaker and a number of

others perhaps deliberately forgot that we offered one of the most forward-looking plans for the control of atomic energy that, I think, has ever been offered to the world. And we certainly didn't block that. We tried disarmament, but you know as well as I do you can't take away the sword entirely and turn it into a plowshare over night (*Applause.*)

Congressman Short: And because of Russia's stubborn and consistent refusal to coöperate with other members of the United Nations, and by constantly using her veto power, it's been necessary for us to remain strong until we can get an agreement among the different nations, as long as there's freedom in the world. We'll trust God, but we'll keep our powder dry. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Short. The young lady under the balcony. Yes.

Lady: My question is for Senator Tydings. By establishing an international police force in the United Nations, will a budget for real international security be necessary to fight off any aggressor?

Senator Tydings: No, if we had disarmament all over the world, with the only police force existing in the command of the United Nations, then obviously it would be stronger than any other nation and be in a position to enforce the peace. That is what our country proposed twice, in the United Nations, to the delegates there assembled. The Russians vetoed it twice. I, myself, twice offered in the Senate a resolution for world disarmament under the very terms that you have outlined. I'm very sorry that we could not get the cooperation from some countries which would have eliminated this fear all over the world and turned these great revenues into more useful purposes than those of mere armament of nations and hate and ill-will toward all. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady right here.

Lady: Senator Johnson, do you think that the increased taxes that this armament program is costing industry has got to the point where it's dangerous to our national economy?

Senator Johnson: Well, the difficulty is that we're not levying those taxes. We're planning on carrying on this great program out of deficit spending. Now if we were levying taxes and collecting

taxes, it wouldn't have near the dangers to our economy that it has at the present time, but we're not doing that. We're not levying any taxes. You couldn't get a tax bill through Congress with a sledge hammer. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the aisle.

Man: My question is addressed to Congressman Short. Since America will be the only nation capable of waging global warfare for several years to come, why spend extravagantly now on armaments that will then be obsolete?

Congressman Short: That's a very pertinent question, because the planes we had on the drawing board, when the last war broke out, were never used in that war. But we must carry on scientific research, technological development, and remain strong, because we're the only nation that can maintain and preserve the peace.

I'm not underestimating the potential possibilities of another great power. We must realize how she has expanded since the close of the war, not only in Europe, but also in Asia, and, perhaps, is the greatest menace to the peace of the world.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Short. Senator Tydings has a comment on that.

Senator Tydings: In arranging a preparedness program, we must strike a balance between quality and quantity. We must try to have

on hand sufficient weapons to defend ourselves always, and at the same time keep new weapons that are more powerful coming along. It is to keep a balance between quality and quantity that we are constantly striving. That's what all nations do.

We can't just throw away the weapons that we have because better ones have been invented. We keep those we have until we get enough of the new ones, and keep that process of quality and quantity in balance as far as our resources will permit. That is the only way we can keep our country in a state of preparedness so that it is stronger than any of its potential enemies.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady on the front row.

Lady: My question is addressed to Mr. Baldwin. Can you help us visualize 15 billion dollars by telling us what we would get in tanks, ships, planes, and so forth?

Mr. Baldwin: You are not getting tanks, ships, planes, because 50 per cent of the defense dollar goes to the pay of personnel, upkeep, maintenance, and hospitalization. That's why I said, as I did in my talk, that the only way you're going to get cuts of billions of dollars in the defense budget is by cuts in numbers of personnel. If you cut 100,000 men off the roll, you save a billion dollars a year.

The previous speaker, Senator Tydings, referred to the point, which I think Mr. Short missed

in my address, that I do not think we have today a proper balance between quality and quantity. We've got too much emphasis on numbers and not enough on quality. Otherwise, we would have the best tanks in the world and we'd be building more carriers and we would be producing better jet engines. By cutting some of the numbers and putting that money into development, I think we'd be far better off ten years from now.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Baldwin. Congressman Short has a comment there.

Congressman Short: I am glad that I can heartily agree with both Senator Tydings and Mr. Baldwin on this particular point. I had written, but did not have time to state in my original statement, "Mere billions of dollars will not give real security unless they're wisely spent, nor will mere numbers of men and guns guarantee our protection. The quality of weapons and intensive training of men are more important." (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. I see a question up there from another gentleman from California. One of our new trustees, Mr. Bill Joyce. Mr. Joyce?

Mr. Joyce: My question is to Senator Johnson. In addition to the billions of dollars being spent in Army, Navy, and Air Force, and other physical things, is there any idea of implementing the President's Inaugural Address with respect to his fourth point on the

development of technique and the industrialization of the world, which might be a weapon of defense in this discussion we're having tonight?

Senator Johnson: Well, I think that the President's fourth point was the grandest thing that I've heard in any presidential speech for a long, long time, and that was to make American technology and science available to all the world, not for making war, not for building fighting machines and weapons of war, but to build for peace — a constructive use.

There's one thing that I've noticed tonight, Mr. Denny. United Nations has hardly been mentioned once. The last time I was down here, the words United Nations were on everyone's lips constantly, and tonight it's a forgotten thing.

Mr. Denny: Well, Senator, it came up twice I think. All right. What did you say, Congressman?

Congressman Short: I mentioned it. (Laughter.)

Mr. Denny: All right. There's another distinguished guest in our house tonight — another military analyst I see up there by Mr. Joyce. Major George Fielding Eliot. (Applause.)

Major Eliot: Mr. Denny, I haven't got a question. I have a comment. I have listened with great interest to this discussion. I find something in what all the speakers have said to agree with and some disagreement here and there.

This matter of quality and quantity is one that needs to be understood and examined a lot more than it has, especially in the matter of having balance between what you've got that you can use now and what you've got that you can mobilize if you have trouble later on.

Our whole military policy has always been based on the idea that we're going to mobilize our forces *after* war begins, and we're going to have plenty of time to do it. Under present conditions, we're not likely to have that now. What we have that we can deal with in the way of ready forces, to deal with an immediate emergency, is the deterrent factor in the minds of anybody who may be thinking of launching a war. But ready force, that you can use now, is the most expensive form of military preparation.

I think that the distinction between ready force and reserve forces ought clearly to be understood. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Tydings has a comment there. For the benefit of our television audience, I might tell them that that lovely lady on Major Eliot's left is his lovely wife. (Applause.) Go ahead, Senator.

Senator Tydings: As for this balance between quality and quantity, the bombs which fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed 135,000 men, women, and children in a fraction of a second. Recently, Mr. Odom, I think it was,

flew in a single-engine plane from Honolulu to New York only five weeks ago. The distance from Honolulu to New York is 700 miles greater than from Maine to Moscow.

Now you can see that while you're searching for quality—and that search should be eternal and hard-pressed — you have always got to have quantity from now on, for never, never again will there be the luxury of time in which to get ready. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady on the front row there.

Lady: Representative Short. Getting back to that 15 billion dollars, that we were really talking about in the beginning of the program, and the wise spending of it, I think you mentioned that in 1939 it cost about 50 million dollars to build a ship and now it costs about 100 million dollars for the same thing. Is it not possible that the figures can be trimmed down in that respect from 100 million dollars at least to 75 million? Imagine what that would do in improving the implements of war, because that, in my estimation, is what we need. I don't say by cutting down quality, but by carefulness.

Congressman Short: Certainly, it's a consummation devoutly to be wished, and most to be desired, but with the increase in the cost of materials and of labor, how can you expect to buy the finished product?

Lady: I think we can try for that.

Congressman Short: I think, perhaps, by mass production and as materials become more abundant and available that we can cut the cost in the manufacture by keeping competition strong among different manufacturing concerns.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady there.*

All right, now while our speakers prepare their summaries, here is a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: A few weeks ago we told you about an eighteen-months-old baby who made a contribution to send Town Meeting 'Round-the-World. In the next mail, came the following letter: "I heard your broadcast Tuesday evening and I will not be outdone by any mere babe of eighteen months, and a girl at that. I am twenty months old. I am A. J. Amidon, Jr., and I am sending \$2.00 to aid in your splendid project. Let's help our friends across the seas to know America. Come on, Mt. Morris! Let's go! Yours respectfully, Johnnie Amidon, Mt. Morris, Michigan."

From Detroit, Michigan, Joan Brisson sent a contribution from the students in the Jackson Intermediate School.

Then, from the Robert Fulton School of North Bergen, New Jersey,

*Mr. Denny ruled out the last question on the grounds that it was an anonymous attack on a particular industry which constituted a smear on the whole industry and could not be answered.

sey, came four letters from four different organizations in the same school, each one containing a contribution of the students to our Round-the-World Town Meeting.

We are most grateful for this support from these and other high school students across the country. Have you sent in your dollars for democracy? Why not do so to-night? The address is Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46.

Now for the summaries of to-night's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Here is Congressman Short with his summary.

Congressman Short: The amount of money spent for national security will vary with changing world conditions. The behavior of other nations will largely determine the size of our own military establishment.

It is to be hoped that international tensions will ease to the point where we, along with other nations, can drastically cut expenditures for armed forces and give relief to the overburdened taxpayers. Great as that burden is today, I repeat that taxes to maintain peace are much better than taxes to pay for global conflict or to suffer a military defeat. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Johnson.

Senator Johnson: I do not like to be an old penny-pincher or wet blanket, but I am alarmed by the certainty of the indescribable world misery which must follow

our national bankruptcy if we stretch our economy too far.

We must remember that whatever expensive military program we adopt this year, we must be able to maintain at an accelerated tempo year after year from this day henceforth. Senator Tydings, I am afraid we will run out of rope.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Johnson. Now, Senator Tydings.

Senator Tydings: If we do run out of rope, the man will drown, and we don't want that to happen. We must constantly work in every way we can to try to effect a world climate where reason will take the place of force and where preparedness to the extent we have practiced it will not be necessary.

But, in the meantime, we must point our international policy so that we are not taken unawares, that we keep people who are like-minded alerted to the common danger, and keep ourselves strong at home.

God and destiny have put the leadership and the safety of the world in the keeping of the United States of America. So far as my vote and voice and influence are concerned, we shall not fail that destiny. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Tydings. And now Mr. Hanson Baldwin.

Mr. Baldwin: In substance, ladies and gentlemen, there is no easy road to real national security.

First, national security is relative and not absolute, nor can it be achieved by armed force alone.

Second, security lies abroad as well as at home.

Third, greater emphasis on quality and less on quantity is imperative.

Fourth, there must be better integration and more efficiency within the national military establishment.

And fifth, and last, the Congress must resume its constitutional duty of auditing the budget. It must be the watchdog of the American pocketbook. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Baldwin, Senator Tydings, Senator Johnson, and Congressman Short, for helping us to understand this important question. Copies of tonight's discussion will be available in your Town Meeting Bulletin which may be obtained by sending ten cents to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, New York.

Now next week, my friends, we begin our 15th year on the air. Actually, this is the final broadcast of our 14th year. We are celebrating it by launching the most ambitious program in our entire experience. With your help, we are taking Town Meeting around the world.

Our primary aim is to do what we can to prepare the American people for their responsibilities of leadership in the world today. We are the richest, the most produc-

tive, the most powerful Nation in all the world, and great things are expected of us as Senator Tydings and the others have told us here tonight. We must measure up to these responsibilities.

To help us meet these responsibilities, your Town Meeting will originate twelve programs in twelve world capitals to be broadcast in this country at this regular hour during July, August, and September. Two of our speakers will be citizens of the country in which the program originates, two will be Americans. Our audience will be composed largely of citizens of these twelve countries. You will hear each program in English at our regular time.

We still need your dollars for democracy, and hope that you will take our fourteenth birthday as an occasion to send your contribution if you have not already done so. Won't you help now by sending your contribution to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, New York.

Next week our subject will be "How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Soviet Russia?" Our speakers will be H. V. Kaltenborn, radio commentator; Robert Magidoff, Congressman Walter H. Judd, and James P. Warburg. We invite you to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the crier's bell. (*Applause.*)